

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 13, 2005 has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. The present Amendment amends claims 1, 2, 6-9 and 21, and adds new claim 38, all in accordance with the originally-filed specification. No new matter has been added. In addition, claim 5 has been cancelled by the foregoing amendment. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-38 remain in this application, and claims 1, 9, 21 and 38 are in independent form.

Initially, the Examiner has objected to claims 2 and 8 for two small informalities. In particular, in claim 2, the term "are" has been modified to "area", and in claim 8, the term "at" has been modified to "and". Accordingly, Applicant has incorporated all of the Examiner's suggested modifications to these claims. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 2 and 8 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that the subject matter of claims 6, 7, 9-30, 32 and 33 define over the prior art of record. In particular, the Examiner has objected to these claims as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-5, 8, 31 and 34-37 stand rejected. Specifically, claims 1-5, 8, 31 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fig. 1 of the present application, (which was labeled prior art) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,720,930 to Johnson et al. (hereinafter "the Johnson patent"). In addition, claims 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fig. 1 of the present application, in view of the Johnson patent, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,658 to Raistrick et al. (hereinafter "the Raistrick patent"). In view of

the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections.

The Examiner indicated that dependent claim 6 contains allowable subject matter. Claim 6 depends from claim 5, which depends from independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of both dependent claim 5 and dependent claim 6, such that claim 1 has been rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is now in allowable form.

Claims 2-4, 7, 8, 13-20 and 31-33 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Further, the Examiner has already indicated that the subject matter of claims 7, 13-20, 32 and 33 defines over the art of record. Accordingly, these claims are further allowable for these reasons.

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claim 9 contains allowable subject matter. Claim 9 previously depended from independent claim 1. Through the foregoing amendment, dependent claim 9 has been amended to include the limitations of the base claim (independent claim 1), and is therefore in allowable form. Claims 10-12 depend directly from and further limit independent claim 9, such that claims 10-12 are also allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with claim 9.

The Examiner also indicated that dependent claim 21 contained allowable subject matter. Claim 21 previously depended from independent claim 1. Accordingly, the limitations of independent claim 1 have been inserted into claim 21, which is now in independent form. Accordingly, independent claim 21 is allowable. Claims 22-30 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 21, and are allowable for the

Application No. 10/824,261
Paper Dated: September 6, 2005
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 13, 2005
Attorney Docket No. 4005-040346


reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with claim 21.

Finally, the Examiner indicated that dependent claim 7 contained subject matter that defined over the art of record. Claim 7 previously depended from claim 5, which previously depended from independent claim 1. Accordingly, the limitations of claims 1 and 5 have been incorporated with the limitations of claim 7 into new independent claim 38. Accordingly, independent claim 38 is in allowable form. Further, the dependency of claim 6 has been modified to depend from new claim 38 and is therefore allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 38.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that claims 1-4 and 6-38, as amended and added, are patentable over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims 1-4 and 6-38 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 
Nathan J. Prepelka
Registration No. 43,016
Attorney for Applicants
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com